



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.: General
13 April 2010

Original: English



**Third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder
meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform
on biodiversity and ecosystem services**
Pusan, Republic of Korea, 7–11 June 2010

**Options for improving the science-policy interface for
biodiversity and ecosystem services**

Note by the secretariat

Introduction

1. The Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), by its decision 25/10 of 20 February 2009, noted the outcomes of the first ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, from 10 to 12 November 2008, and recognized and emphasized the need to strengthen and improve the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services for human well-being and sustainable development at all levels. The Governing Council took note of the preliminary report on the gap analysis carried out by UNEP to facilitate further discussions on the improvement of the science-policy interface.
2. On that basis and by the same decision, the Governing Council invited Governments and relevant organizations to continue to explore mechanisms to improve the science-policy interface for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, long-term human well-being and sustainable development, taking into account the special need to develop and maintain the technical and scientific capacity of developing countries with regard to biodiversity-related issues. The Governing Council requested the Executive Director of UNEP to undertake a further process to support efforts by Governments and relevant organizations to explore mechanisms to improve and strengthen the science-policy interface, aiming to report on its progress at the special session on biodiversity of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly and other relevant meetings. For that purpose, the Governing Council also requested the Executive Director to convene a second intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting at the earliest possible convenience in 2009, following completion of the full gap analysis on exploring mechanisms to improve the science-policy interface.
3. The second meeting was convened in Nairobi from 5 to 9 October 2009. In his summary of the meeting,¹ the Chair noted that representatives had all acknowledged the importance of biodiversity and

¹ Any text drawn from the Chair's summary included in the present note has been edited to bring it into line with United Nations editorial standards.

ecosystem services, which, while critically important for sustainable development and current and future human well-being, particularly for poverty eradication, were currently experiencing significant loss; that the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services must be strengthened at all levels; the importance of ensuring the quality and independence of the science made available; and the importance of active collaboration with relevant United Nations agencies to maximize synergies and build capacity to mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services.

4. Participants recommended that the Executive Director of UNEP should report at the eleventh special session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, in February 2010, on the outcome of the meeting, and that the Governing Council should request the Executive Director, in cooperation with the relevant United Nations agencies, to convene a third and final meeting, the outcome of which should be transmitted to the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session, in 2010.

5. Subsequently, at the eleventh special session, ministers and heads of delegation committed themselves, through the Nusa Dua Declaration, to finalizing deliberations on improving the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services in 2010 and in so doing negotiating and reaching agreement on whether to establish an intergovernmental science-policy platform.

6. The Governing Council also adopted decision SS.XI/4, by which it invited Governments and relevant organizations to finalize in 2010 their deliberations on improving the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, long-term human well-being and sustainable development and requested the Executive Director to support efforts by Governments and relevant organizations to finalize the above-mentioned deliberations and, in so doing:

(a) To convene, in June 2010, a third and final ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting to negotiate and reach agreement on whether to establish an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources;

(b) To make available to all parties concerned, including participants in the third meeting, the information requested at the second meeting² in good time for the third meeting;

(c) To transmit, on behalf of the Governing Council, the outcomes of and necessary documentation from the third and final meeting to the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session for consideration during the high-level segment on biological diversity in September 2010 and thereafter.

7. The Governing Council also invited Governments and organizations in a position to do so to provide extrabudgetary resources for the above-mentioned process and requested the Executive Director to cooperate closely with the secretariats of the relevant biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa, multilateral financial institutions and relevant international organizations, in particular the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, to ensure the full involvement of key stakeholders in the preparation of the third meeting.

8. The following documents have been prepared by the secretariat to complement the present note and support deliberations further:

(a) Analysis of the assessment landscape for biodiversity and ecosystem services (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/1);

(b) Analysis of the assessment landscape for biodiversity and ecosystem services: executive summary (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/1/Add.1);

(c) Current and future status of biodiversity and ecosystem service indicators (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/2);

(d) Current and future status of biodiversity and ecosystem service indicators: executive summary (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/2/Add.1);

2 UNEP/IPBES/2/4/Rev.1, annex, para. 29.

- (e) Analysis of capacity development for biodiversity and ecosystem services (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/3);
 - (f) Analysis on capacity development for biodiversity and ecosystem services: executive summary (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/3/Add.1);
 - (g) Options and criteria for selecting the secretariat (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/4);
 - (h) Options and criteria for selecting the secretariat: executive summary (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/4/Add.1);
 - (i) Background on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/5);
 - (j) Background on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: executive summary (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/5/Add.1);
 - (k) Indicative budget for an intergovernmental science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/6);
 - (l) Indicative budget for an intergovernmental science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services: executive summary (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/6/Add.1).
9. Representatives may wish to consider the information set out below when deliberating on how to strengthen the science-policy interface.

Points for consideration and options

10. The points for consideration and relevant options presented below draw on the Nusa Dua Declaration; the Chair's summary of the second meeting (UNEP/IPBES/2/4/Rev.1); and the gap analysis presented at the second meeting (UNEP/IPBES/2/INF/1).
11. Many points for consideration go towards addressing the key modalities for a new platform, should it be established. Many factors central to any intergovernmental platform, such as the selection of authors, the peer review process and the report approval process, are not presented herein. The choice of working groups and their modalities are also not presented, as representatives at the second meeting suggested that these might be considered when developing principles and procedures at the first plenary meeting of the platform, if the latter is established.
12. The present note takes guidance from the Chair's summary of the second meeting, in which the Chair noted that in general strong support was expressed for a new intergovernmental mechanism to strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services, provided that it did not duplicate or substitute the mandates or programmes of work of existing multilateral environmental agreements or mechanisms, where the strengthening of existing mechanisms was inadequate.
13. The considerations presented herein are not mutually exclusive and the choice of an option in one consideration might have implications for the choice of options in other considerations. The considerations presented are also not exhaustive, but are the main considerations that have emerged from discussions at the first two meetings on this subject. Participants might also consider other options or hybrids of the options already presented. The principle that form should follow function is followed in presenting the points for consideration.

A. Consideration 1: How to strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services

14. Representatives having considered at the second meeting the gap analysis undertaken, the Chair noted in his summary that:
- (a) There was agreement that a strengthened science-policy interface needed scientific independence (credibility, relevance and legitimacy); knowledge generation (collaboration and coordination for common and shared knowledge bases); knowledge assessments (regular and timely assessments to generate and disseminate policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive advice with full and equal involvement of experts from all regions of the world); knowledge use (support for policy development and implementation); and capacity-building to enhance the science-policy interface and

mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services for human well-being (e.g., poverty eradication, food, water and energy security) – paragraph 4 of the Chair’s summary;³

(b) There was recognition that the science-policy interface could, at least in part, be improved by strengthening existing mechanisms, but that a new mechanism building upon existing and strengthened mechanisms could potentially add significant value in areas in which strengthening was inadequate – paragraph 5;

(c) There was agreement that no intergovernmental mechanism currently existed to meet all the science-policy needs of the various multilateral environmental agreements and processes in the field of biodiversity and ecosystem services – paragraph 6;

(d) In general strong support was expressed for a new intergovernmental mechanism to strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services, provided that it did not duplicate or substitute the mandates or programmes of work of existing multilateral environmental agreements or mechanisms, where the strengthening of existing mechanisms was inadequate – paragraph 26.

15. Three possible options are suggested:

(a) *Option 1:* To create a new intergovernmental platform to strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services that would not duplicate or substitute the mandates or programmes of work of existing multilateral environmental agreements or United Nations bodies;

(b) *Option 2:* To focus solely on strengthening existing science-policy structures of multilateral environmental agreements and United Nations bodies;

(c) *Option 3:* To create a new intergovernmental platform to strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services that would not duplicate or substitute the mandates or programmes of work of existing multilateral environmental agreements or United Nations bodies, and to work to strengthen, and improve coordination between, those existing structures.

B. Consideration 2: Processes that a new platform, if established, should support

16. On this subject, the Chair noted that:

(a) There was agreement that no intergovernmental mechanism currently existed to meet all the science-policy needs of the multiple multilateral environmental agreements and processes in the field of biodiversity and ecosystem services – paragraph 6;

(b) Assessments should be demand-driven, based on problem identification and user needs, including the needs of decision makers, all relevant multilateral environmental agreements (e.g., the six biodiversity-related conventions, including the Convention on Biological Diversity; the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage; the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora; the Convention on Migratory Species; the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat; the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture; and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa), and United Nations agencies – paragraph 12.

17. Four possible options are suggested:

(a) *Option 1:* Focusing on Governments’ needs, the new platform would respond to requests from Governments conveyed through the Convention on Biological Diversity;

(b) *Option 2:* Focusing on Governments’ needs, the new platform would respond to requests from Governments conveyed through the six biodiversity-related conventions;

(c) *Option 3:* Focusing on Governments’ needs, the new platform would respond to requests from Governments conveyed through multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services and United Nations agencies;

3 All further references to paragraph numbers are to the Chair’s summary.

(d) *Option 4:* Focusing on Governments' needs, the new platform would respond to requests from Governments conveyed through multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services and United Nations agencies, in addition to requests from all relevant stakeholders, such as international scientific organizations, non-governmental organizations and the private sector.

C. Consideration 3: Function or work programme of the new platform, if the latter is established

18. On this subject, the Chair noted that:

- (a) A new platform could play a critical role in coordinating and catalysing existing mechanisms, in addition to performing a number of functions currently not being performed by any other organization or mechanism. Initial ideas for potential platform functions included:
- (i) Catalysing improved collaboration and coordination for the generation of knowledge for a common and shared knowledge base by:
 - a. Identifying and prioritizing key scientific information needed by policymakers at various spatial scales, including through the assessment process;
 - b. Creating a mechanism for dialogue between the scientific community, policymakers and funding organizations to catalyse the generation of the required information nationally and in partnership with international organizations such as the International Council for Science and its programmes, such as Diversitas, and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. The mechanism would not fund or conduct primary scientific research itself;
 - (ii) Coordinating and performing regular and timely assessments to generate and disseminate policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive information by:
 - a. Identifying the need for, and catalysing the implementation of, subglobal assessments (national, subregional and regional) that would build on and coordinate with the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment follow-up;
 - b. Synthesizing the findings of subglobal assessments regionally and thematically;
 - c. Conducting comprehensive subregional, regional and global assessments, building upon the subglobal assessments and other sources;
 - d. Undertaking assessments on thematic issues;
 - e. Disseminating assessment findings to appropriate stakeholders;
 - f. Maintaining an up-to-date catalogue of relevant assessments and facilitating collaboration with such assessments while avoiding duplication;
 - (iii) Supporting policy formulation and implementation by identifying policy-relevant tools and methodologies and meeting the needs of policymakers and other users of scientific information. That would include providing assessment findings at various spatial scales and information on best-practice use of the tools and methodologies and, where needed, catalysing their further development;
 - (iv) Building capacity to mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services for human well-being by identifying capacity-building needs (building upon the indicative list above) of scientists, policymakers and other users of scientific information over a range of spatial scales and creating a mechanism, with organizations responsible for capacity-building, including the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for financing, and activities of UNDP, UNEP, UNESCO, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, the World Bank, regional development banks and civil society organizations to facilitate and leverage the delivery of identified needs. Most participants expressed support for enhancing

national capacity, especially in developing countries, including improving access to relevant scientific information and technologies, and providing training programmes and opportunities – paragraph 24.

1. Generation of knowledge

19. Three possible options are suggested:

(a) *Option 1:* The new platform would identify and prioritize key scientific information needed for policymakers [at various scales], but would not directly undertake work to generate new knowledge;

(b) *Option 2:* The new platform would identify and prioritize key scientific information needed for policymakers [at various scales] and facilitate dialogue between key scientific organizations, policymakers and funding organizations to catalyse efforts to generate new knowledge, but would not directly undertake work to generate new knowledge;

(c) *Option 3:* The new platform would play no active role in knowledge generation.

2. Regular and timely assessments

20. The three options presented below draw on the findings of the gap analysis presented at the second meeting (UNEP/IPBES/2/INF/1) and the assessment landscape paper (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/1):

(a) *Option 1:* The new platform would perform regular, timely [and responsive] assessments of the status of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services, which would include comprehensive global assessments, comprehensive subglobal (major regional) assessments and thematic issues at appropriate scales. The new platform would maintain a catalogue of relevant assessments, identify the need for subregional and national assessments and help to catalyse and coordinate such assessments through existing processes, including the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment follow-up strategy;

(b) *Option 2:* The new platform would perform regular, timely [and responsive] assessments of the status of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services, which would include comprehensive global assessments, comprehensive subglobal (major regional) assessments, subregional and national assessments and thematic issues at appropriate scales. The new platform would maintain a catalogue of relevant assessments;

(c) *Option 3:* The new platform would have no active role in undertaking regular and timely assessments.

3. Supporting policy formulation and implementation

21. Three possible options are suggested:

(a) *Option 1:* The new platform would support policy formulation and implementation by identifying policy-relevant tools and methodologies, such as those arising from assessments, and working with other existing structures including the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment follow-up strategy to enable decision makers to gain access to and apply those methods and tools, and to catalyse further development;

(b) *Option 2:* The new platform would support policy formulation and implementation by identifying [and developing] policy-relevant tools and methodologies, such as those arising from assessments; assist decision makers in gaining access to and applying those methods and tools; and catalyse further development;

(c) *Option 3:* The new platform would have no active role in supporting the application of policy-relevant tools and methodologies.

4. Building capacity

22. The options presented below draw on the capacity-building assessment paper (UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/3). The needs identified therein include:

(a) Enhancement of national capacities to utilize fully the best available scientific information to implement a science-policy interface in support of sound policymaking;

- (b) Access to data, information and knowledge – for example, free and open online access to journals, virtual libraries, geo-referenced data and satellite data;
- (c) Access to technologies and tools, including on the use of assessments, ecosystem valuation and modelling, in support of science-policy interfaces;
- (d) Training programmes and opportunities for scientists from developing countries, such as through the provision of scholarships and fellowships.

23. The present note does not provide options regarding which of the capacity-building needs identified above should be adopted by a new platform, if established. It instead provides options on the scope of the capacity-building activities that a new platform might take, should it be established. Four possible options are proposed:

- (a) *Option 1:* The new platform would prioritize the key capacity-building needs to improve the science-policy interface [at all levels] and provide financial support for the highest priority needs, namely those related directly to its scientific activities, and decided by the plenary;
- (b) *Option 2:* The new platform would prioritize key capacity-building needs and then provide financial support for the highest priority needs, as decided by the plenary, and catalyse financing for capacity-building by hosting a forum with conventional funders of capacity-building to stimulate funding for broader capacity-building activities related to the platform that are better funded through existing bilateral and multilateral organizations;
- (c) *Option 3:* The new platform would prioritize key capacity-building needs and catalyse financing by hosting a forum with conventional funders of capacity-building to stimulate funding for both the highest priority needs decided by the plenary, in addition to broader capacity-building activities related to the platform that are better funded by existing bilateral and multilateral organizations;
- (d) *Option 4:* The new platform would have no active role in capacity-building.

D. Consideration 4: Legal basis, governance and decision-making structure of the new platform, if the latter is established

24. On this subject, the Chair noted that:

- (a) In general strong support was expressed for a new intergovernmental mechanism to strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services, provided that it did not duplicate or substitute the mandates or programmes of work of existing multilateral environmental agreements or mechanisms, where the strengthening of existing mechanisms was inadequate. Most participants endorsed the importance of ensuring the scientific independence of the new intergovernmental mechanism by having its governance structure separate from, but responsive to, the governance structures of multilateral environmental agreements and United Nations bodies – paragraph 26;
- (b) There was general agreement that the plenary should comprise representatives from all Governments represented in the United Nations, with participants being invited from relevant stakeholder groups. Some representatives said that participants representing relevant stakeholders should be invited as observers, whereas others argued that these participants should be invited according to the modalities to be agreed by the platform at its first meeting, should it be established – paragraph 25 (a);
- (c) Two views were expressed with regard to an executive body or bureau. One view was that it should comprise elected scientific and technical experts in a manner analogous to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, with appropriate geographic balance and appropriate ad hoc members (e.g., chairs of the scientific subsidiary bodies of the six biodiversity-related conventions and Convention to Combat Desertification). Those participants saw no need for a scientific advisory panel given the scientific and technical excellence of the elected members of the executive body or bureau. The other view was that the members of the executive body or bureau should not be technical experts and should perform administrative functions only, meaning that the body would then need to be complemented by an elected scientific advisory panel to ensure scientific credibility, with appropriate ad hoc members (e.g., chairs of multilateral environment agreement scientific subsidiary bodies) – paragraph 25 (b);
- (d) A range of views were expressed on the relationship between the platform and governing bodies of the six biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements and the

Convention to Combat Desertification, and United Nations agencies, with many participants supporting a direct relationship between the agreements and the plenary or executive body, while those supporting a scientific advisory panel preferred the interface of the agreements to be with the scientific advisory body – paragraph 25 (c).

1. Legal status of a new platform

25. Three possible options are suggested:

(a) *Option 1:* The new platform would be established as an intergovernmental body whose status would be distinct from the existing intergovernmental organizations but institutionally linked to one or more existing intergovernmental organizations (e.g., through the provision of the secretariat or administrative services therefor). It might be established by a decision of an intergovernmental meeting, such as the General Assembly, or by a decision of an existing intergovernmental organization or concurrent decisions of two or more intergovernmental organizations upon recommendation of an intergovernmental conference;

(b) *Option 2:* The new platform would be established as a body in which intergovernmental and non-governmental entities would be combined and would be distinct from the existing international organizations but institutionally linked to one or more existing international organizations (e.g., through the provision of the secretariat or administrative services therefor). It might be established by a decision of an intergovernmental conference;

(c) *Option 3:* The new platform would be established as an intergovernmental body, which would be a subsidiary body of an existing intergovernmental organization. It might be established by a decision of the governing body of an existing intergovernmental organization. It should be mentioned that, should this option be chosen, then the governing body of the existing intergovernmental organization would make all subsequent decisions on the platform.

2. Governance and decision-making: plenary body

26. Should a new, independent platform be established that is an intergovernmental body whose status is distinct from existing intergovernmental organizations, it would require a primary decision-making body involving participating Governments and possibly relevant stakeholders. The functions of such a plenary body might include the following:

- (a) Overseeing the operation of the new platform;
- (b) Taking decisions on the platform's institutional arrangements;
- (c) Determining the procedure for receiving the corresponding request for assessments by potential clients;
- (d) Determining the procedure for the approval of assessments to be carried out by the platform;
- (e) Adopting a programme of work, including a list of topics to be tackled;
- (f) Approving the budget;
- (g) Reviewing the implementation of the programme of work, including financial and operational reports prepared by a secretariat;
- (h) Reviewing, adopting or approving major reports or executive summaries;
- (i) Adopting principles and procedure, including the rules of procedure of meetings and financial rules.

27. Options for the modality of the plenary body might include the following:

(a) *Option 1:* The platform, including the plenary and informal meetings, would be open to participation by all States, in addition to intergovernmental organizations and other relevant stakeholders having received a standing invitation from the plenary. It would comprise those States having signalled their intention to participate in the platform. All those Governments would meet in plenary meeting and each Government would have one vote. All other relevant stakeholders would be able to participate in the proceedings of plenary meetings without the right to vote;

(b) *Option 2:* The platform, including the plenary and informal meetings, would be open to participation by all States, in addition to intergovernmental organizations and other relevant stakeholders having received a standing invitation from the plenary. Each Government would have one vote. All other relevant stakeholders would also have qualified votes, the total number of which should not exceed the total number of votes of participating Governments.

28. Options for the chair of the plenary might include:

(a) *Option 1:* A single chair to be selected by the plenary from government and non-government nominations. The chair would serve for a period decided by the plenary;

(b) *Option 2:* Two co-chairs to be selected by the plenary from government and non-government nominations. The co-chairs would serve for a period decided by the plenary.

3. Governance and decision-making: executive and/or advisory bodies

29. The key functions of the executive and/or advisory bodies include:

(a) Identifying donors and partnership arrangements for the implementation of activities;

(b) Overseeing the implementation of the platform's activities according to the principles and procedures established by the plenary;

(c) Overseeing the management of financial resources and reporting thereon to the plenary;

(d) Considering and deciding whether reports submitted by the working groups and task forces should be classified as accepted, adopted or approved as defined in the principles and procedures of the platform;

(e) Overseeing the peer review process to ensure the highest levels of scientific quality and credibility for all products delivered by the platform;

(f) Selecting experts to undertake the platform's scientific activities;

(g) Identifying emerging issues that warrant further scientific analysis;

(h) Approving specific scientific procedures related to the conduct of assessments and other studies.

30. Options for the decision-making authority for the platform might include:

(a) *Option 1:* A bureau only, with no separate scientific advisory panel. In this case, the bureau would meet as necessary and its functions would include all the functions as specified above and approved by the plenary;

(b) *Option 2:* An executive board and scientific advisory panel. In this case, the executive board would meet as necessary and its functions might include a subset of the functions specified above and as determined by the plenary. The scientific advisory panel would meet as necessary and would serve primarily to oversee the platform's scientific credibility, and its functions might include a subset of the functions specified above as determined by the plenary.

31. Options for the composition of a bureau might include:

(a) *Option 1:* Government representatives only. In this case, the selection criteria and the number of representatives per region would be specified by the plenary, and regional representatives would be nominated by Governments from the region and approved by the plenary. The term of each bureau member would be determined by the plenary. The chair or co-chairs of the platform would also be the chair or co-chairs of the bureau. Representatives of relevant United Nations bodies and multilateral environmental agreements would be ex officio members. Gender balance would be duly taken into account in appointing bureau members;

(b) *Option 2:* Government and non-voting non-government representatives only. In this case, the number of government and non-government representatives per region would be decided by the plenary. The number of representatives per region for government representatives and the criteria for the selection of non-government representatives and the organizations permitted to nominate non-governmental representatives would be specified by the plenary. Government representatives from each region would be nominated by countries in region and approved by the plenary. Non-governmental representatives would be nominated by selected non-governmental bodies and approved by the plenary. The term of each bureau member would be determined by the plenary. The chair or co-chairs of the

platform would also be the chair or co-chairs of the bureau. Representatives of relevant United Nations bodies and multilateral environmental agreements would be ex officio members. Gender balance would be duly taken into account in appointing bureau members. Only government representatives would have voting rights;

(c) *Option 3:* Government and voting non-government representatives. In this case, the scenario is the same as in option 2, but all other relevant stakeholders would have qualified votes, the total number of which should not exceed the total number of votes of participating Governments.

32. Options for the composition of an executive board might include:

(a) *Option 1:* Government representatives only. In this case, the number of representatives per region would be specified by the plenary, and regional representatives would be nominated by Governments from the region and approved by the plenary. The chair or one co-chair of the platform would also chair the executive board. Representatives of relevant United Nations bodies and multilateral environmental agreements would be ex officio members. Gender balance would be duly taken into account in appointing board members;

(b) *Option 2:* Government and non-voting non-government representatives. In this case, the number of government and non-government representatives per region would be decided by the plenary. The number of representatives from each region for government representatives and the criteria for the selection of non-government representatives and the organizations permitted to nominate non-governmental representatives would be specified by the plenary. Government representatives from each region would be nominated by countries of the region and approved by the plenary. Non-government representatives would be nominated by selected non-governmental bodies and approved by the plenary. The chair or one co-chair of the platform would also chair the executive board. Representatives of relevant United Nations bodies and multilateral environmental agreements would be ex officio members. Each Government would have one vote. All other relevant stakeholders would have no voting rights. Gender balance would be duly taken into account in appointing board members;

(c) *Option 3:* Government and voting non-government representatives. In this case, the scenario is the same as in option 2 but all other relevant stakeholders would have qualified votes, the total number of which should not exceed the total number of votes of participating Governments.

33. Options for the composition of a scientific advisory panel might include:

(a) *Option 1:* Regional balance. The number of scientists per region would be decided by the plenary. The criteria for the selection of scientists would be approved by the plenary. Scientists would be nominated by relevant scientific bodies and Governments in respective regions, selected by the board and approved by the plenary. The chair or one co-chair of the platform would chair the scientific advisory panel. Gender balance would be duly taken into account in appointing panel members.

(b) *Option 2:* No regional balance. The number of scientists would be decided by the plenary. The criteria for the selection of scientists would be approved by the plenary. Scientists would be nominated by international relevant scientific bodies and Governments and selected by the board and approved by the plenary. The chair or one co-chair of the platform would chair the scientific advisory panel. Gender balance would be duly taken into account in appointing panel members.

E. Consideration 5: Need for, location and host of a secretariat

34. On this subject, the Chair noted that there was general agreement on the need for a small secretariat, but that the functions, sponsors and location should be assessed. The UNEP secretariat was requested to assess various types of secretariat institutional arrangements and the criteria to be used to select the secretariat's location – paragraph 25 (e).

35. The functions and options presented below draw on document UNEP/IPBES/3/INF/4, which assesses options and criteria with regard to selecting the secretariat. The secretariat's functions might include the following:

(a) To support the platform's work by organizing meetings and providing administrative and substantive support for meetings and other work;

(b) To identify, acquire, coordinate and manage information to assist the platform in its work and to manage data, resources and documents to support its work;

- (c) To assist in preparing documents for, and reports to, the governing body of the platform and others as needed;
- (d) To facilitate coordination between working groups;
- (e) To liaise with member Governments, civil society organizations and all other relevant stakeholder organizations;
- (f) To organize and coordinate public information and outreach activities, including editorial work and the release of reports and other products;
- (g) To serve as a focal point to promote and facilitate achievement of the platform's objectives;
- (h) To develop the platform's programme and budget and manage and report on related funds and trust funds;
- (i) To help to mobilize financial resources in accordance with the governing body's directions.

36. Three possible options are suggested:

(a) *Option 1:* The secretariat would be hosted by one or more existing intergovernmental organizations within the United Nations. It might be established by a resolution of the General Assembly upon recommendation of an intergovernmental conference or by a decision of an existing intergovernmental organization or concurrent decisions of two or more intergovernmental organizations;

(b) *Option 2:* The secretariat would be hosted by one or more existing intergovernmental organizations outside the United Nations system, with or without the support of intergovernmental organizations inside the system. It might be established by a decision of an existing intergovernmental organization or concurrent decisions of two or more intergovernmental organizations upon recommendation of an intergovernmental conference;

(c) *Option 3:* The secretariat would be hosted wholly or partly by an existing intergovernmental organization whose secretariat is hosted by another organization. It might be established by a decision of the governing body of an existing intergovernmental organization upon recommendation of an intergovernmental conference;

(d) *Option 4:* The secretariat would be hosted by one or more international non-governmental organizations, together with one or more intergovernmental organizations. It might be established by a decision of the governing body of an existing intergovernmental and international organization upon recommendation of an intergovernmental conference.

F. Consideration 6: Funding

37. On this subject, the Chair noted that there had been limited discussion of a financing mechanism, beyond the possible establishment of a trust fund, or the level of financial needs, which could not be evaluated until the work programme had been finalized – paragraph 25 (g).

38. Two possible options are suggested:

(a) *Option 1:* A trust fund would be established with voluntary contributions from Governments, United Nations agencies, GEF and others;

(b) *Option 2:* A trust fund would be established with prescribed contributions based on the United Nations scale from Governments, plus voluntary contributions from United Nations agencies, GEF and others, such as the private sector and foundations.